

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 2008-007**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** Arco Service Station Development
- Concurrent Entitlements:** Conditional Use Permit No. 2008-020
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Huntington Beach  
2000 Main Street  
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
- Contact:** Andrew Gonzales, Associate Planner  
**Phone:** (714) 536-5271
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** 21452 Brookhurst Street (Northeast Corner of Brookhurst Street and Hamilton Avenue)
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Michael C. Adams  
21190 Beach Blvd.  
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
- Contact Person:** Michael C. Adams  
**Phone:** (714) 374-5678
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** CG-F1 (Commercial General – 0.35 maximum floor area ratio)
- 6. ZONING:** CG (Commercial General)

**7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project includes a request to permit the demolition of an existing service station containing four self-service fuel dispensers, including removal of underground storage tanks and soil remediation as necessary, and construction of a new service station with a 2,400 sq. ft. convenience food market including the sale of beer and wine with an attached 960 sq. ft. automated car wash. The proposal includes six new self-service fuel dispensers covered by a gas pump canopy. Presently the site has two vehicular access points (one on Brookhurst St. and one on Hamilton Ave.) that will remain. However, the Hamilton Avenue driveway will be relocated further east and consolidated with an adjacent driveway, which serves an adjoining City lift station, to provide greater vehicular mobility onto both sites. A total of 10 onsite parking spaces will be provided. The proposed location of the convenience store and automated carwash building is centrally located at the north of the site with the gas pump islands and canopy located to the south of the site. The convenience store will have 1-2 employees per shift (5 employees total) and the proposed hours of operation are seven days a week, 24

hours a day. The hours of operation for the automated carwash will operate seven days a week between the hours of 7AM to 7PM.

**8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:**

The project site is located at the northeast corner of Brookhurst Street and Hamilton Avenue. The project site is developed and operated with an automobile service station. An automobile service station exists to the south, across Hamilton Avenue. An automobile service station and multi-tenant commercial/retail center exist to the east. A drive-thru restaurant exists to the north and multi-family residential development to the northeast. To the east of the site exists a City lift station with exclusive access provided and adjoining the existing service station driveway along Hamilton Avenue.

**8. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:**

None.

**10. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED) (i.e. permits, financing approval, or participating agreement):**

The project requires approvals from the Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA) and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) prior to issuance of city building permits.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or is "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning       | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic           | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing      | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils           | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials    | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality               | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |

## **DETERMINATION**

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☒

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or a "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one impact (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, **nothing further is required**. ☐

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
4. “Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVIII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix G of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the City of Huntington Beach’s requirements.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, a list of applicable standard conditions identified in the discussions has been provided as Attachment No. 6.

---

### ***SAMPLE QUESTION:***

<i>ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i>				
<i>Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Huntington Beach General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).</i>				

---

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

**I. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1,2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site is presently developed with a service station. The City's zoning map and general plan land use element designate the site for general commercial uses. The proposed project is consistent with the development standards within these designations (including setbacks, building height, parking, and floor area ratio). Service stations are permitted within the Commercial General zoning district with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The project is consistent with the following General Plan goals, objectives, and policies:

LU 1.1 – Provide for the timing of residential, commercial, and industrial development coincident with the availability of adequate market demand to ensure economic vitality.

LU 2 – Ensure that development is adequately served by transportation infrastructure, utility infrastructure, and public services.

LU 4 – Achieve and maintain high quality architecture, landscape, and public open spaces in the City.

LU 4.2.1 – Require that all structures be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the City's building and other pertinent code regulations.

LU 7.1.1 – Accommodate existing uses and new development in accordance with the Land Use and Density Schedules.

The project involves the modernization of a dated self-service station in order to ensure the economic growth and vitality of the site by upgrading the existing business to better serve the market demand of local consumers. The project is located in an urbanized area with adequate infrastructure to service the site. The development is in compliance with the Urban Design Guidelines. The architecture provides variations in roof heights, a prominent entry, and enhanced building materials. The service station will be constructed in accordance with the City building requirements and other applicable code requirements. No impacts to land use and planning would occur.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not located within an area designated as a wildlife habitat area. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as none exists in the City. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 3,4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project would not disrupt or physically divide an established community. The subject site is located within an established urban area and does not propose any roads or features that would divide an established community. The project would not impact access to surrounding development. Therefore, no impacts would occur

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

**II. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1,4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not be growth inducing through construction or extension of roads or other infrastructure. The proposed use of the site is general commercial and will cater to local residents and commuters along Brookhurst Street and Hamilton Avenue. There will be no substantial growth as a result of the project because it will replace an existing service station use. No impacts are anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not displace existing housing. No impacts are anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not result in the displacement of people since the site is zoned for commercial uses and proposes to demolish and reconstruct a service station and ancillary uses. No impacts resulting from the development are anticipated.

**III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Sources: 1, 13) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The project site is not known to be traversed by an active fault and is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1,13, 17)

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California. Therefore, the site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Structures built in Huntington Beach are required to comply with standards set forth in the California Building Code (CBC) and standard City codes, policies, and procedures that require submittal of a detailed soils analysis prepared by a Licensed Soils Engineer. Conformance with CBC requirements and standard City code requirements will ensure potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1,6)

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: Displacement, compactions, and over covering of soil associated with construction of the new structures will occur but are considered minor. Although the site is located within an area identified by the City's General Plan as having a very high potential for liquefaction, the project site is not located within a liquefaction zone, according to Seismic Hazard Zones maps of the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG). The project will be subject to a standard code requirement that a detailed soil analysis be prepared by a registered engineer and submitted for review by the City. This analysis shall include on-site soil sampling and laboratory testing of materials to provide detailed recommendations for grading, chemical and fill properties, retaining walls, streets, and utilities. Therefore liquefaction impacts associated with seismic related ground failure to people and structures on-site would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides? (Sources:1,6)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the site is not in an area susceptible to slope instability. All onsite structures will be built on level pad sites. The project site is located on a flat parcel of land and no slopes or other landforms susceptible to landslides exist in the vicinity of the property. Moreover, the California Division of Mines and Geology has not mapped any earthquake-induced landslides at, or in the vicinity of, the site that would be indicative of the potential for slope instability. No impacts from landslides are anticipated.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1,6)

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: Site preparation may result in short term wind and water erosion impacts; however, the project will be subject to standard code requirements requiring implementation of dust control measures and submittal of an erosion control plan. After completion, the site will be covered with structures, landscaping, and paving which would preclude substantial soil erosion. Standard conditions requiring the preparation of a grading plan by a registered engineer will be enforced. Submission of a soils report is required to address issues regarding excavation, grading, fill, foundation and utilities. The site is flat and does not contain any unique geologic or physical features. The entire site will be re-graded. The project does not propose a substantial amount of earth moving or any other activities which result in unstable earth moving condition or change in geologic substructures. Less than 50 cubic yards of cut will be excavated and a new concrete slab on grade will be poured for the building pad. Additional excavation such as testing boring, installation of air sparging/ soil vapor extraction system, dual-phase extraction system, and monitoring wells may be performed as deemed

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

necessary by the OCHCA and SARWQCB due to ongoing soil remediation. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?<br>(Sources: 1,6,17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: According to the Seismic Hazard Map, the project is not located in an area with a potential for liquefaction or an earthquake-induced landslide. However, in the event of an earthquake in the Huntington Beach area, the site may be subject to ground shaking. Standard code requirements as explained above address lateral spreading and subsidence.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1,6) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Based upon the City's General Plan and Geotechnical Inputs Study, the project is located within an area of expansive soil. This is common in the City and impacts can be addressed through compliance with applicable soils, grading, and structural foundation requirements and code ordinances such that any potential expansive soil impacts will be reduced to a level of insignificance. The project will be subject to standard code requirements necessitating review and approval by the Public Works Department. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is located in an urbanized area in which wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. Therefore, the capability of the soils to support septic tanks or alternative waste water systems is not relevant to the proposed project. No impact would occur related to septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

#### **IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Water quality standards and waste discharge requirements will be addressed in the project design and development phase through preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared by a Licensed Civil or Environmental Engineer in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations for and approval by the City of Huntington Beach Department of Public Works. The SWPPP and WQMP will establish Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction and post-construction operation of the facility, including



ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

source, site and treatment controls to be installed and maintained at the site. The WQMP and SWPPP are standard requirements for development in the City of Huntington Beach, and with implementation, will ensure compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, which will reduce project impacts to a level that is less than significant. Additionally, the Public Works Department recommends that car wash and surface runoff under the gas pump canopy not drain to any storm drain system, but rather be directed to the sanitary sewer (upon approval by the Orange County Sanitation District), through an engineered infiltration system, clarifier or to an equally effective alternative. This is a typical solution for auto related uses for fun off. Therefore, incorporation of the Public Works' requirements and recommendations will result in a less than significant impact.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Water Division of the Public Works Department reviewed the project and did not indicate concerns about any substantial impacts to ground water supplies due to the nature of the proposed use. Additionally, the subject site is not located near any active ground water wells. Although the project will contribute to cumulative water usage in the City, it is considered insignificant since the estimated water demand for the proposed project represents a minimal increase over the existing use, can be accommodated by the City's water service capacity and does not represent a significant increase in demand. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site? (Sources: 1,17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not impact the course of a stream or river, as none exist on the site. With development of the project, approximately 59% of the site will be paved, 26% will be covered with buildings, and 15% will be landscaped. Slight decreases in existing surface runoff may occur due to the reduction of paving from 89% and an increase in landscaping from 6% to 15%. The inclusion of the carwash will not impact erosion or siltation on or off site because all water drainage onsite will be directed into the sanitary sewer through an engineered infiltration system, clarifier or to an equally effective alternative. The project will be subject to standard code requirements requiring submittal of grading plans and hydrology and hydraulic studies for review and approval by the Public Works Department to determine that the runoff generated by the proposed project will not adversely impact existing drainage systems and adjacent properties.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 1,17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Runoff from the subject site will not result in an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. An additional 9% of water pervious area will reduce the existing rate of surface runoff. The Department of Public Works is requiring that all remaining runoff will be captured and directed into a sanitary sewer through an engineered infiltration system, clarifier or to an equally effective alternative, especially with runoff associated with the carwash. Also, see discussion under Section IV(c). Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1,17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(d).

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1,17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Public Works Department requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to be prepared in accordance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations in order to control the quality of water runoff and protect downstream areas. NPDES requirements assure compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements. The project is recommended by the Public Works Department to not direct runoff to any storm drain system but to the sanitary sewer through an engineered infiltration system, clarifier or to an equally effective alternative. The WQMP shall be submitted to the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a precise grading permit for the project. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 1,7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is located within Flood Insurance Rate map (FIRM) Zone X, which is not subject to Federal Flood Development requirements and is outside the 100-year flood hazard area. Moreover, the project does not include housing. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1,7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project site is designated as Flood Zone X on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), which is not subject to Federal Flood Development restrictions. The project site is not situated within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped in the FIRM. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1,7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is not located within a flood hazard zone. In addition, the site is not in the immediate vicinity of a levee or dam. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: According to the Moderate Tsunami Run-up Area map in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is not located in an identified moderate tsunami run-up area. Due to the lack of land-locked bodies of water (i.e., ponds or lakes) in proximity to the project site, the potential for seiches is considered to be non-existent. The project site and vicinity are urbanized and have relatively flat topography. The project site and vicinity are not identified as areas with the potential for mudflows. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.				
k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1,17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a).				
l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 1,4,17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section IV (a), (c), and (d) above.				
m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 1,4,17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a).				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 1,4,17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Sections IV(a) and (d).				
o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? (Sources: 1,4,17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(d).				
p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 1,4,6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section III(b).				

**V. AIR QUALITY.** The city has identified the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district as appropriate to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 9,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 9,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 9,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 9,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 9,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: a) – e) Short-term: The construction of the project may result in short-term air pollutant emissions from the following activities: the commute of workers to and from the project site; grading activities including the transport of any necessary soil import and/or export, delivery and hauling of construction materials and supplies to and from the project site; fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment; and dust generating activities from soil disturbance. To reduce emissions, standard City requirements regulate operational construction conditions by requiring construction equipment be maintained in peak operating condition, the use of low sulfur fuel by weight, prohibiting truck idling for periods longer than ten minutes, and discontinuing construction activity during second stage smog alerts. Emissions during construction were calculated using URBEMIS2007 program (version 9.2.4). The allotment of equipment to be utilized during each phase was based on defaults in the URBEMIS2007 program and was modified as needed to represent the specifics of the proposed project. The amount of soil excavation (50 cubic yards) and the truck trips necessary to haul the excavated soil was taken into consideration. The default level of detail was used to calculate fugitive dust emissions from activity on the approximately 0.61 acre site.

The URBEMIS model calculates total emissions, on-site and offsite, resulting from each construction activity which are compared to the SCAQMD Regional Thresholds. A comparison of the project's total emission with the regional thresholds is provided below. A project with daily construction emission rates below these thresholds is considered to have a less than significant effect on regional air quality.

Construction Emissions						
SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	VOC	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	SOx
Estimated Construction Emissions for proposed project	1.01	0	1.87	24.75	5.24	0
Significance Threshold	550	75	100	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the aforementioned table, construction emissions from the proposed project would not exceed the regional thresholds. VOC levels are negligible and are associated with only the exterior coating for the convenience market and automated carwash structures. Therefore a less than significant impact during construction is anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact      Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated      Less Than Significant Impact      No Impact

Long-term: Air pollutant emissions due to the project were also calculated using the URBEMIS2007 program version (9.4.2). The program was set to calculate emission for a 2,400 sq. ft. convenience market with gas pumps. The calculation also factored in the 968 sq. ft. automated carwash. The default URBEMIS2007 variables were used for the calculations.

Operational Emissions						
SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	VOC	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	SOx
Estimated project Emissions for proposed project	48.91	0	5.47	8.04	1.55	0.05
Significance Threshold	550	75	55	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the aforementioned table, operational emissions from the proposed project would not exceed the regional thresholds. Therefore a less than significant impact is anticipated.

#### VI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections?) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- (Sources: 1,9,17)

Discussion: The proposed development will generate 170 daily new vehicle trips based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Code 944. Access to the project exists along Brookhurst Street, designated as a Major Arterial, and Hamilton Avenue, designated as a Primary Arterial on the Circulation Plan of Arterial Streets and Highways in the General Plan (1996). Based on the number of new daily trips, the City's Traffic Division has indicated that the project will not result in unacceptable levels of service (LOS) for roadway segments and intersections existing in the project vicinity. Presently both roadways operate at a LOS B during PM peak traffic conditions. No significant impacts result from the trips generated by the proposed project.

Construction related traffic may have an impact on existing parking, vehicle circulation, and pedestrians due to construction vehicles parked or entering and/or exiting the project site. These potential impacts may be reduced through implementation of code requirements requiring Department of Public Works approval of a construction traffic control plan. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1,9,17)
- |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Refer to the discussion under item VI(a) above. Increased trip generation from long-term operation of the project will not exceed level of service (LOS) standards on designated Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) intersections in the project vicinity. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 1,9)
- |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not located within five miles of a public or private airstrip and does not propose any structures of substantial height to interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 1)
- |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Project access will be provided via new/relocated driveway off of Hamilton Avenue and an existing driveway off of Brookhurst Street. The new Hamilton Avenue driveway will improve onsite circulation by increasing vehicular mobility to and from the site and improve offsite circulation by moving the driveway further from the intersection. Additionally, the new driveway improves crane and equipment mobility by creating safe access for City vehicles accessing the lift station. The project access and circulation design has been reviewed by the City, more specifically the Public Works Traffic Division, and is considered adequate. No impacts are anticipated.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1)
- |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Emergency access to and within the project site would be designed to meet City of Huntington Beach Police and Fire Departments' requirements, as well as the City's general emergency access requirements. The Fire and Police Departments have reviewed the proposed plans and determined that emergency access is adequate. Construction related traffic may have an impact on existing vehicle circulation and pedestrians by construction vehicles parked or entering/exiting the project site. However, a traffic control plan is required for project construction, which would minimize potential impacts to emergency access vehicles near the project site during construction. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 2)
- |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: A total of 10 parking spaces are required for the project. A total of 10 parking spaces will be provided on the site in compliance with the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance (HBZSO). The proposed project has been designed according to City parking regulations and provides sufficient parking spaces.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?<br>(Sources: 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will provide bicycle racks onsite, in accordance with the requirements of the HBZSO Section 231.20—*Bicycle Parking*. No impacts are anticipated.

**VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is presently developed with a service station and located in a commercial area of the City. It does not support any unique endangered species and is not shown in the General Plan as a generalized habitat area; therefore, no impacts to any habitat or wildlife area are anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service. The project will not result in any loss to endangered or sensitive animal or bird species and does not conflict with any habitat conservation plans.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not contain any wetlands; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.



ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1,9)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The project area is surrounded by similar service station uses, as well as, commercial and residential developments. The site does not support any fish or wildlife and would not interfere with the movement of any fish or wildlife species nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impacts are anticipated.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1,9)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The site is currently developed and does not contain any mature trees, or rare and unique plant species. Construction of the project will be subject to standard City requirements for the submittal of a landscape plan. Landscaping associated with the proposed project will introduce new plant species to the site; however, plant materials are expected to be common landscaping species and will be contained within the project boundaries. The project would be required to provide approximately eight trees on site in accordance with standard Huntington Beach Zoning & Subdivision requirements. No impacts are anticipated.

- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 1,9)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: As discussed above, the project site is presently developed. It does not support any unique or endangered plant or animal species and is not a part of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan; therefore, no impacts to any habitat or wildlife area are anticipated.

## VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1,9)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The proposed commercial development will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource. The project site is not designated as a known mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not designated as an important mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan or any other land use plan. Development of the project is not anticipated to have any impacts on mineral resources. No impacts to mineral resources are anticipated.

## IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1,9,17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project involves the handling, routine transport, and use of gasoline which is flammable liquid and can be considered hazardous. The project is subject to current code requirements requiring approval from the OCHCA and Fire Department prior to the installation and/or removal of underground flammable or combustible liquid storage tanks. In addition, a soil testing plan shall be approved by the Fire Department prior to commencement of any construction activities. All results will conform to City specifications and be approved by the Fire Department prior to the issuance of building permits, including a remediation action plan. With these standard conditions of approval, impacts relating to hazardous material are considered less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1,9,17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will be subject to regulation by the OCHCA and Fire Department for any possible hazardous materials. A Phase 1 Site Assessment submitted for the site identifies traces of soil contamination which requires the submittal of a Remediation Action Plan (RAP) for review and approval by the Fire Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit. A copy of the approved OCHCA plan and written permission for co-existence must be submitted in order to obtain Fire Department approval. Presently the site is identified by the SARWQCB as "case open" with "gasoline" as the potential contaminants of concern and the media affected as "other groundwater" (uses other than drinking water) with ongoing remediation. A permit cannot be issued by the City until written authorization is received from both OCHCA and SARWQCB. Based on compliance of such standards and the information noted in Section IX(a), less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?<br>(Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site is adjacent to commercial and residential uses and the nearest school is approximately half-mile from the subject site, therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The location of the proposed development is not listed on the State's Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List. No impacts would occur.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The City of Huntington Beach is included in the Orange County Airport Environs Land Use Plan due to the Los Alamitos Armed Forces Reserve Center. However, the site is located such that it would not be impacted by flight activity from the center. No impacts are anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not near any private airstrips. No impacts are anticipated.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not impede access to the surrounding area nor impair implementation or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The use of the property as a service station does not serve a role in any emergency response plan. No impacts would occur.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project is located in an urbanized area and is not near any wild lands. No impacts are anticipated.

**X. NOISE.** Would the project result in:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1,2,16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: During site grading for the new building and other construction phases of the project, noise levels on the site may increase from normal construction vehicles such as concrete trucks and a backhoe as well as other equipment and tools typically used on construction sites. However, the development will be required to comply with the City Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.40 Noise Control), which restricts the hours of construction to reduce impacts to the area. The development will include a service station with six self-serve fuel dispensers, a 2,400 sq. ft. convenience market, and a 960 sq. ft. automated carwash. The fuel dispensers and convenience market will be operational throughout the week on a 24 hour basis. The automated car wash will be operational between the hours of 7AM and 7PM. According to an acoustical study prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc., no significant operational impacts are anticipated due to the nature of the use, which is compatible with the character of the area. The study identifies that the maximum noise level from the project to the nearest sensitive land use (i.e., residential) will range anytime from 53.4 to 53.7 dBA during daytime hours and 49.8 to 50.5 dBA during evening hours which is less than the 60 dBA exterior noise threshold standard identified in the Noise Ordinance. These noise levels are generated from the site autonomous from other noise generated from surrounding properties and roadways. However, a measurement of the present noise levels indicate that site experiences noise levels approximately 67.1 dBA as measured from a distance of 100 feet from the centerline of roadways. The site's existing development currently generates approximately 200 average daily trips. It is expected that the project will generate approximately 170 average daily trips more after the development, resulting in an average of approximately seven additional vehicle trips per hour, which based on a noise model concludes that future roadway noise will remain at approximately 67.1 dBA regardless of the additional trips generated. Furthermore, any long-term noise impacts from the project are subject to compliance with the City Noise Ordinance as well but are not expected to be a concern due to the proposed use of the site. The proposed project is not anticipated to exceed existing noise levels and thresholds and, therefore, less than significant short- and long-term noise impacts resulting from the new development project are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: No significant additional ground borne vibration is anticipated given the anticipated traffic volume generated by the project which is considered less than significant and does not significantly impact the level of service on area roadways. Truck traffic from the project is expected to be limited to weekly gas deliveries and delivery trucks. No significant impacts are anticipated.</p>				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The type of noise to be generated by the project in the long term will be similar to that generated by the existing gas station and other commercial uses in the area and is not anticipated to increase the ambient noise levels significantly. See also Section X(a).</p>				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project is anticipated to generate short-term noise impacts during construction. Based on the City's Noise Ordinance standard code requirement, which regulates hours of construction, a less than significant impact is anticipated. No other significant noise impacts are expected after construction due to the nature of the project, which is compatible with other uses in the area.</p>				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1,9,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The City of Huntington Beach is included in the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center in Los Alamitos. However, the site is located a considerable distance from the Training Center, such that the project would not be impacted by flight activity and noise generation from the Center. No impacts are anticipated.</p>				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.</p>				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

**XI. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- The Fire Department reviewed the project and indicated that it is required to comply with several code requirements and specifications. The project site is within the area of five-minute response time from the Magnolia and Bushard Fire Stations and can be served by existing facilities. Based on this, no impacts are anticipated.
- b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- Discussion: The Police Department reviewed the project and indicated that they have no significant concerns that cannot be addressed. The operation of a 24-hour convenience market with beer and wine sales may result in additional calls for service, however, the Police Department has indicated that the project can be adequately served with existing Police services. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.
- c) Schools? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- Discussion: The site is located approximately half of a mile from the nearest public or private school and will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts. Payment of school impact fees will be required prior to issuance of building permits. The project involves the redevelopment of a site with an existing service station use. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated based on the location of site and nature of the use.
- d) Parks? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- Discussion: The project is not expected to have significant impacts to park facilities based on the location of the site with surrounding commercial and residential uses, nor will result in a significant demand of existing park facilities. Commercial development does have an impact on existing parks and is mitigated through payment of an in-lieu fee. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
- e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- Discussion: The project is located at an existing development and all facilities needed to serve it are already in place. The project has been reviewed by various City Departments, including Public Works, Building and Safety, Fire Police, and Planning for compliance with all applicable City codes. With compliance of standard code requirements, and compliance with City specifications, no significant adverse impacts to public services are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

**XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1)
- |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will demolish and replace an existing service station with two additional gas pumps and a new convenience market and automated carwash. A Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be prepared in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations and approved by the City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department. The WQMP will establish Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction and post-construction operation of the project and its implementation will ensure compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1)
- |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: As indicated under section IV(a), a standard requirement and condition will address wastewater quality issues. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1)
- |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not expected to result in the construction of new or significant expansion of existing wastewater treatment facilities that will be serving the development. The project will only require incremental extensions of public services and utilities to the site, provided by the respective governmental agencies and utility companies, at the expense of the applicant. All utility connections to the project will be in accordance with all applicable Building Codes, City ordinances, Public Works standards, and Water division criteria. With the implementation of standard conditions of approval, no significant impacts to the City's utilities or services are anticipated and would not cause significant environmental effects.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1)
- |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project would result in a minimal increase in water usage on the subject site based on the addition of the proposed convenience store, two additional gas pumps, and carwash. The carwash component is ancillary to primary service station use and not anticipated to result in a demand of water that will result to a level of significance. Based on this, the project is expected to have less than significant impact on water supplies.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Sources: 1)

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The proposed project would result in a minimal increase in wastewater on the subject site based on the addition of restroom facilities, carwash, and runoff from impervious surfaces, however, the commercial uses proposed are expected to have less than significant impacts on wastewater treatment capacity. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1)

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The project would result in a minor increase in development intensity on the site and is not of regional significance. Based on this and the nature of uses proposed, the project is not anticipated to noticeably impact the capacity of the nearest existing landfill known as Frank R. Bowerman Landfill located in the City of Irvine. The landfill has a remaining capacity in excess of 30 years based on the present solid waste generation rates. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project will be served by Rainbow Disposal and will be subject to participation in any solid waste reduction programs presently available in the City. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

- h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 1,17)

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a).

### **XIII. AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1,3,4)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project is located in an established commercial and residential area and is surrounded by similar developments. It is not located adjacent to a state scenic highway nor is it in an area with any scenic vistas.



ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1)
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The site is presently developed with a service station. It does not contain any scenic resources such as rock outcroppings or historic buildings. No adverse aesthetic impacts are anticipated.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1,9)
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The proposed building and associated gas pump canopy will be designed and constructed of similar colors, materials, and scale found in the surrounding development. This includes the same color palette and similar mass and height of other structures in the project area. The project will incorporate modern architectural design and should be an enhancement to the aesthetics of the area and will be required to comply with landscaping requirements. No impacts to aesthetics are anticipated with the proposed development.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1,3,4)
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: Lighting will be included throughout the project and will be in character with lighting found in typical commercial areas. Lighting will be located underneath the fuel dispenser canopy and generally located on the exterior wall of the convenience market building. The project will be subject to a condition of approval that requires lighting to be shielded and directed so as to prevent glare and spillage onto adjacent properties, specifically residential, and roadways. Although the project will result in an increase in light, the additional lighting in the community is considered less than significant as the area is already developed.

#### **XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 9)
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project site is developed with an existing service station and does not contain any historic structures and is not located within any potentially historic area listed in the General Plan. No historical resources will be impacted by construction of the project.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 9)
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The site is currently developed with a service station and the project proposes to improve the site with a convenience store, two additional gas pumps, and an automated carwash. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change of an archaeological resource and no impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is developed with an existing service station and does not contain any unique geologic features. It is not designated as having any paleontological resources. No impacts are anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Based on the discussion under item XIV (b), the project is not expected to result in the disturbance of human remains.

**XV. RECREATION.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Although employees of the proposed use may visit existing park facilities, no significant increase in the uses of existing neighborhood, community and regional park or recreational facilities is anticipated based on the small size of the project. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not require the construction or expansion of new or existing recreational facilities. The proposed use is for a convenience store, service station, and automated carwash, therefore no adverse impacts to recreational facilities area anticipated. See discussion under Section XI(d).

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not require the construction or expansion of new or existing recreational facilities. The proposed use is for a convenience store, service station, and automated carwash, therefore, no adverse impacts to recreational facilities area anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

**XVI. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The subject site is developed with an existing service station and surrounding by commercial and residential uses, and does not contain any farmland. Development of this project will not result in the conversion of any farmland.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The subject site is presently zoned CG (Commercial General) which does not permit agricultural uses. Development of this project will not conflict with existing zoning for agriculture use.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? ? (Sources: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site is presently developed with a service station and is surrounded by commercial and residential uses. Therefore, the development will not result in the loss of any farmland.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1,3,4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is currently on a developed commercial site. It is not located within any wildlife or biological resource area and therefore will not impact any fish, wildlife, or plant community. The site does not contain any historic resources. Based on discussions in Sections I to XVI above, the project would not have impacts on the quality of the environment.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (Sources: 1,2,9)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: As discussed above in Sections I to XVI, the project is not anticipated to have any significant individual and cumulative impacts due to the small scale of the project and implementation of the standard code requirements.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources:1,2,9)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: As discussed above in Sections I to XVI, the project as proposed and with implementation of the recommended code requirements and conditions of approval will have a less than significant impact on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

## **XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSIS.**

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis:

<b><u>Reference #</u></b>	<b><u>Document Title</u></b>	<b><u>Available for Review at:</u></b>
1	City of Huntington Beach General Plan	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
2	City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance	“
3	Project Vicinity Map	See Attachment #1
4	Reduced Site Plan, Floor Plan and Building Elevations	See Attachment #2
5	Project Narrative	See Attachment #3
6	City of Huntington Beach Geotechnical Inputs Report	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
7	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (April 13, 2005)	“
8	CEQA Air Quality Handbook South Coast Air Quality Management District (1993)	“
9	City of Huntington Beach CEQA Procedure Handbook	“
10	Trip Generation Handbook, 7 <sup>th</sup> Edition, Institute of Traffic Engineers	“
11	Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (Oct. 17, 2002)	“
12	Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List	“
13	State Seismic Hazard Zones Map	“
14	City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code	“
15	Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4 Report (November 7, 2008)	See Attachment #4

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16	Acoustical Study prepared by Mike Dickerson (July 25, 2008)			See Attachment #5	
17	Project Implementation Code Requirements (December 1, 2008)			See Attachment #6	